UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/667,401	09/23/2003	Gerald Altman	Papec40567	9364

21587 7590 05/31/2006

ALTMAN & MARTIN
6 BEACON ST, STE 600
BOSTON, MA 02108

EXAMINER	
LOVEL, KIMBERLY M	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2167	

DATE MAILED: 05/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/667,401	ALTMAN, GERALD	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kimberly Lovel	2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 September 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-10* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-10* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *23 September 2003* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-10 are rejected.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8 and 9 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 2 lists two limitations labeled (e). It is suggested that the labels be adjusted. Also, it is suggested that an "and" be placed at the end of limitation (o).

Claim 3 states the limitation (p) after the limitation (d). It is suggested that limitation (p) be re-labeled as limitation (e). Also, it is suggested that an "and" be placed at the end of limitation (d).

Each limitation of claim 4 ends in a comma. It is suggested that the commas be replaced with semi-colons.

There are two separate independent claims labeled as claim 6. The second claim labeled as 6 will now be considered to be claim 7. Claims 7-9 are now considered to be 8-10 and are also considered to be dependent on claim 7.

Appropriate correction is required.

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: Fig 12. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or

amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. Claims 2, 3, 4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims recite "physical documents and things" or "physical documents including things." The specification fails to explicitly define the term "things," therefore it is unclear what is meant by the term "things."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

MPEP 2106 IV.B.2.(b)

A claim that requires one or more acts to be performed defines a process. However, not all processes are statutory under 35 U.S.C. 101. Schrader, 22 F.3d at 296, 30 USPQ2d at 1460. To be statutory, a claimed computer-related process must either: (A) result in a physical transformation outside the computer for which a practical application is either disclosed in the specification or would have been known to a skilled artisan, or (B) be limited to a practical application.

Claim 1 recites a computer process comprising entry into a storage array, at a succession of date/time instances, a succession of records of electronic documents, some of which may have corresponding physical originals; the electronic copy created from the physical copy is considered to represent the other half of the pair; since the electronic document is created by scanning the physical document, it is considered to be visually identical, assignment of attributes to the records in any data-type formats that characterize the documents, assignment of a succession of unique date/time identifiers to the succession of records in correspondence with the date/time instances of their entry, selection of a range of date/time instances that correspond to a to a range of the records of documents that are known to be uncorrupted, and selection of groups of electronic documents having logically related attributes within the range of the uncorrupted documents.

For the result to be tangible, it must be more than a thought or a computation and must have a real world value rather than being an abstract idea. The invention as

recited in the claim enters data into an array. It is unclear to as what kind of tangible output is obtained by these limitations.

Claim 2 recites a database for storing and retrieving physical documents and electronic documents. A database per se represents nonfunctional descriptive material, which is considered to be nonstatutory subject matter.

Claim 3 recites a document-centric database for storing and retrieving physical documents and electronic documents. A database per se represents nonfunctional descriptive material, which is considered to be nonstatutory subject matter.

Claim 4 recites a document-centric database. A database per se represents nonfunctional descriptive material, which is considered to be nonstatutory subject matter.

Claim 5 recites a database for storing and retrieving physical documents and electronic documents. A database per se represents nonfunctional descriptive material, which is considered to be nonstatutory subject matter.

Claim 6 recites a database comprising a structure of tables. A database per se represents nonfunctional descriptive material, which is considered to be nonstatutory subject matter.

Claim 7 recites a digital process comprising the steps of: (a) sequentially entering a succession of records of electronic documents having date/time data-type addresses into a RAID disk array; (b) sequentially assigning, to said records, selections of data-type attributes including non-date/time attributes; (c) sequentially copying the records to a dedicated memory buffer; (d) sequentially copying old primary data and old parity data

to said dedicated memory buffer; (e) sequentially performing XOR operations to generate new parity data using the data in said dedicated memory buffer; and (f) sequentially storing new primary data and new parity data in said disk array.

For the result to be tangible, it must be more than a thought or a computation and must have a real world value rather than being an abstract idea. The invention as recited in the claim enters data into an array. It is unclear to as what kind of tangible output is obtained by these limitations. Claims 8-10 are dependent are claim 7 and are therefore rejected on the same grounds.

To allow for compact prosecution, the examiner will apply prior art to these claims as best understood, with the assumption that applicant will amend to overcome the stated 101 rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,813,009 to Johnson et al (hereafter Johnson et al).

Referring to claim 1, Johnson et al disclose a computer process comprising entry into a storage array (see column 5, line 66 – column 6, line 6 – a table is considered to represent an array), at a succession of date/time instances (see column 8, lines 40-45 – grouping the record units by a common creation date and time is considered to represent a *succession of date/time instances*), a succession of records of electronic documents, some of which may have corresponding physical originals (column 8, line 60 – column 9, line 13 – the physical documents are scanned into the information location management system and then stored in the physical system; the electronic copy created from the physical copy is considered to represent the other half of the pair; since the electronic document is created by scanning the physical document, it is considered to be visually identical), assignment of attributes to the records in any data-type formats that characterize the documents (see column 8, lines 40-45), assignment of a succession of unique date/time identifiers to the succession of records in correspondence with the date/time instances of their entry (see column 11, lines 15-32), selection of a range of date/time instances that correspond to a to a range of the records of documents that are known to be uncorrupted, and selection of groups of electronic documents having logically related attributes within the range of the uncorrupted documents (see column 5, lines 9-18 – only uncorrupted documents enter the system; corrupted documents are filtered out).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,813,009 to Johnson et al in view of US PGPub 2004/0117361 to Greer et al (hereafter Greer et al).

Referring to claim 2, Johnson et al disclose a database for storing and retrieving physical documents and electronic documents. In particular, Johnson et al disclose a database for storing and retrieving physical documents and electronic documents (see column 5, line 66 – column 6, line 6), said database comprising:

(a) a physical system (see column 26, lines 11-30 and Fig 8) and an electronic system (see column 4, lines 46-52 – a computer based records management system is considered to represent the *electronic system*);

(b) said physical system and said electronic system providing a logical sequence of pairs of said physical documents and said electronic documents (see column 8, lines 40-45 and column 8, line 60 – column 9, line 13 – the physical documents are scanned into the information location management system and then stored in the physical system; the electronic copy created from the physical copy is considered to represent the other half of the pair; grouping the record units by a common creation date and time is considered to represent a *logical sequence*);

(c) said pairs being identified by a logical sequence of the date/time instances of their entry (see column 8, lines 40-45 – grouping the record units by a common creation date and time is considered to represent a *logical sequence of date/time instances*);

(d) the physical document and the electronic document of each of said pairs being substantially identical visually (column 8, line 60 – column 9, line 13 – the physical documents are scanned into the information location management system and then stored in the physical system; the electronic copy created from the physical copy is considered to represent the other half of the pair; since the electronic document is created by scanning the physical document, it is considered to be visually identical);

(e) selected pairs of said physical documents and said electronic documents containing the records of selected entities from a universe of entities (see column 5, line 66 – column 6, line 7);

(e) said physical system containing a master set of said physical documents divided into a plurality of subsets of said physical documents (see column 26, lines 11-30 and Fig 8 – Cases which are located in the cabinet consist of folders which consist of documents which consist of sub-documents which consist of pages; cases, folders, documents, sub-documents and pages are considered to represent a *plurality of subsets*);

(f) the physical sequence of said physical documents substantially corresponding to said logical sequence of said date/time instances of their entry (see column 8, line 43);

(g) said records of said selected entities thereby being intermingled with each other within said plurality of said subsets of said physical documents (see column 26, lines 17-27 – documents are placed in folders and then the folders are placed in cases; placing folders in cases is considered to represent intermingling folders);

(h) separators between said subsets having visual markings that indicate the ranges of said date/time instances of the physical documents in said subsets (see column 8, lines 40-45 – the data units have an identifiable beginning and ending which are considered to represent separators; the subsets can be characterized by a common creation date and time);

(i) said electronic system presenting a plurality of electronic tables having a plurality of electronic fields (see column 11, lines 15-21);

(j) at least one of said fields being a first primary field characterized by a date/time data type, selected entries in said first primary field identifying selected date/time instances (see column 11, lines 27-32);

(k) at least another of said fields being a second primary field characterized by another data type, selected entries in said second primary field identifying selected entities from said universe of entities (see column 11, lines 27-32);

(l) said physical system being operative to enable location of selected physical documents that identify a selected entity, said selected physical documents constituting a virtual file of selected entity records associated with said selected entity (see column 26, lines 11-30 and Fig 8);

(m) said electronic system including a digital processor for presenting electronic sets of selected electronic documents (see column 24, lines 32-37);

(n) said electronic system being operative to enable presentation of selected electronic documents that identify a selected entity, said selected electronic documents constituting an assembled electronic file of selected entity records associated with said selected entity (see column 24, lines 32-37 – the record represents a record located in the physical file system);

(p) the physical location of any particular one of said physical documents being indicated by its date/time instance as presented by said electronic tables (see column 11, lines 15-32).

However, Johnson et al fail to explicitly teach the further limitation of (o) said electronic system including a CODE table containing records of persons organizations, a FILE table containing records of file numbers and physical locations, a CASE table containing combination records in the form cccccffffff corresponding to a junction of CODE and FILE entries, a PLAN table containing records of events, tasks and dates, and a DOC table containing records and views of physical documents including things. Greer et al discloses an electronic system containing tables utilized to organize information (see abstract). In particular, Greer et al disclose the further limitation of (o) said electronic system including a CODE table containing records of persons organizations (see [0213]), a FILE table containing records of file numbers and physical locations (see [0239]), a CASE table containing combination records in the form cccccffffff corresponding to a junction of CODE and FILE entries (see [0206]), a PLAN

table containing records of events, tasks and dates (see [0218]), and a DOC table containing records and views of physical documents including things (see [0210], lines 14-16 – the table contains electronic copies of receipts; a receipt is considered to represent a *physical document*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the specific tables mentioned by Greer et al as the tables in the database of Johnson et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to provide an optimal system in which organizations can create and retain records (Johnson et al: see column 1, lines 13-15).

Referring to claim 3, Johnson et al disclose a document-centric database for storing and retrieving physical documents and electronic documents (see column 5, line 66 – column 6, line 6), said database comprising:

(a) a physical system (see column 26, lines 11-30 and Fig 8) and an electronic system (see column 4, lines 46-52 – a computer based records management system is considered to represent the *electronic system*);

(b) said physical system having separators for storing physical documents and things (see column 8, lines 40-45 – the data units have an identifiable beginning and ending which are considered to represent separators; the subsets can be characterized by a common creation date and time);

(c) said electronic system presenting a plurality of electronic tables, each of said tables representing a grid containing rows of electronic records and columns of electronic fields (see column 11, lines 15-21 – a table is considered to be a grid);

(p) the physical location of any particular one of said physical documents and things being indicated by locations of said separators as indicated by entries in said FILE table (see column 11, lines 15-32).

However, Johnson et al fail to explicitly teach the further limitation of (d) said electronic system including a CODE table containing records of persons organizations, a FILE table containing records of file numbers and physical locations, a CASE table containing combination records in the form cccccffffff corresponding to a junction of CODE and FILE entries, a PLAN table containing records of events, tasks and dates, and a DOC table containing records and views of physical documents including things. Greer et al disclose an electronic system containing tables utilized to organize information (see abstract). In particular, Greer et al disclose the further limitation of (d) said electronic system including a CODE table containing records of persons organizations (see [0213]), a FILE table containing records of file numbers and physical locations (see [0239]), a CASE table containing combination records in the form cccccffffff corresponding to a junction of CODE and FILE entries (see [0206]), a PLAN table containing records of events, tasks and dates (see [0218]), and a DOC table containing records and views of physical documents including things (see [0210], lines 14-16 – the table contains electronic copies of receipts; a receipt is considered to represent a *physical document*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the specific tables mentioned by Greer et al as the tables in the database of Johnson et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been

motivated to do so in order to provide an optimal system in which organizations can create and retain records (Johnson et al: see column 1, lines 13-15).

10. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US PGPub 2004/0117361 to Greer et al in view of US PGPub 2006/0080314 to Hubert et al (hereafter Hubert et al).

Referring to claim 4, Greer et al disclose a database. In particular, Greer et al disclose a document centric database (see abstract) comprising:

(a) an ID table containing records of persons and organizations (see [0213]),

(b) a FILE table containing records of file numbers and physical locations (see [0239]),

(c) a JOB table containing combination records in the form cccccffffff corresponding to a junction of ID and FILE entries (see [0206]),

(d) a PLAN table containing records of events, tasks and dates (see [0218]), and

(e) a DOC table containing records and views of physical documents including things (see [0210], lines 14-16 – the table contains electronic copies of receipts; a receipt is considered to represent a *physical document*).

However, Greer et al fail to explicitly teach the further limitation of a database wherein the database is a document centric database. Hubert et al disclose a system with user directed enrichment and control (see abstract), including the limitation wherein the database is document centric (see lines 13-17).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the document centric database of Hubert et al as the database to contain the database tables mentioned by Greer et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to provide an optimal system in which organizations can create and retain records.

11. Claims 5 and 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US PGPub 2004/0117361 to Greer et al in view of US PGPub 2004/0205387 to Kleiman et al (hereafter Kleiman et al).

Referring to claim 5, Johnson et al disclose an electronic database. In particular, Johnson et al disclose an electronic database (see column 4, lines 46-52 and column 5, line 66 – column 6, line 6) comprising:

(a) a digital processor (see column 24, lines 32-37);

(b) a memory for receiving, under the control of said digital processor, sequential records of a succession of records of electronic documents having date/time data-type addresses (see column 5, lines 54-59; Fig 7; and column 8, lines 40-45); and

(c) said records having selections of data-type attributes including non-date/time attributes (see column 10, lines 26-49).

However, Johnson et al fail to explicitly teach the further limitation of (d) a RAID disk array for receiving and processing entries of said succession of records. Kleiman et al disclose a system for controlling storage of data (see abstract) including (d) a RAID

disk array for receiving and processing entries of said succession of records (see [0009]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the raid disk array of Kleiman et al to replace the array of Johnson et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to provide an optimal system in which organizations can create and retain records.

Referring to claim 7, Johnson et al disclose a digital process. In particular, Johnson et al disclose a digital process (see abstract) comprising the steps of:

(a) sequentially entering a succession of records of electronic documents having date/time data-type addresses (see column 9, lines 57-60) into a RAID disk array;

(b) sequentially assigning, to said records, selections of data-type attributes including non-date/time attributes (see column 11, 27-32);

(c) sequentially copying the records to a dedicated memory buffer (see column 11, lines 41-57);

(d) sequentially copying old primary data and old parity data to said dedicated memory buffer;

(e) sequentially performing XOR operations to generate new parity data using the data in said dedicated memory buffer; and

(f) sequentially storing new primary data and new parity data in said disk array.

However, Johnson et al fail to explicitly disclose the further limitations of (a) using a RAID disk array; (d) sequentially copying old primary data and old parity data to said

dedicated memory buffer; (e) sequentially performing XOR operations to generate new parity data using the data in said dedicated memory buffer; and (f) sequentially storing new primary data and new parity data in said disk array. Kleiman et al disclose a system for controlling storage of data (see abstract) including (a) using a RAID disk array (see [0036]); (d) sequentially copying old primary data and old parity data to said dedicated memory buffer (see [0045]); (e) sequentially performing XOR operations to generate new parity data using the data in said dedicated memory buffer (see [0047]); and (f) sequentially storing new primary data and new parity data in said disk array (see [0047]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the raid disk array of Kleiman et al to replace the array of Johnson et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to provide an optimal system in which organizations can create and retain records.

Referring to claim 8, the combination of Johnson et al and Kleiman et al (hereafter Johnson/Kleiman) discloses the digital process of claim 6 wherein said entering of said succession of records includes mirroring of said records between or among a plurality of the disks of said RAID array (Kleiman et al: see [0086]).

Referring to claim 9, Johnson/Kleiman discloses the digital process of claim 6 wherein said entering of said succession of records includes striping of said records between or among a plurality of the disks of said RAID array (Kleiman et al: see [0009]).

Referring to claim 10, Johnson/Kleiman discloses the digital process of claim 6 wherein said entering of said succession of records includes mirroring and striping of said records between and among a plurality of the disks of said RAID array (Kleiman et al: see [0009] and [0086]).

12. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US PGPub 2004/0117361 to Greer et al in view of US Patent No. 5,813,009 to Johnson et al.

Referring to claim 6, Greer et al disclose a database. In particular, Greer et al disclose a database (see abstract) comprising a structure of tables having the following nomenclature and contents:

(a) an ID table containing records of Persons & Organizations (see [0213]);

(b) a FILE table containing records of File Numbers & Physical Locations (see [0239]);

(c) a CASE table containing combination records in the form cccccffffff, which correspond to a junction of key CODE table and FILE table entries (see [0206]);

(d) a PLAN table containing records of Events, Tasks, Dates (see [0218]); and

(e) a DOC table and form containing records and views of Physical Documents including Things (see [0210], lines 14-16).

However, Greer et al fail to explicitly teach the further limitation of the File table containing file numbers. Johnson et al teaches a database (see abstract) including the further limitation of file numbers (see column 11, lines 27-32)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the specific tables mentioned by Greer et al as the tables in the database of Johnson et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to provide an optimal system in which organizations can create and retain records (Johnson et al: see column 1, lines 13-15).

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimberly Lovel whose telephone number is (571) 272-2750. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kimberly Lovel
Examiner
Art Unit 2167

kml
26 May 2006

Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2167